

9 AUG 1958

*10-6249*

Mr. Eugene Lyons  
Senior Editor  
THE NATION'S RIGHT  
Hempsteadville, New York

Dear Mr. Lyons:

Sometime ago I had an opportunity to read the speech "The Soviet Regime and the Russian People" that you made before the Advertising Club of Springfield, Massachusetts.

Even though belated, I want to let you know that I read it with a great deal of interest.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WMB

Allen W. Dulles  
Director

O/DCI/██████████ 5 August 58

Rewritten: 7 August 58

Distribution:

Orig - Addressee

1 - DCI

1 - Col. Grogan

1 - ██████████

1 - ER w/basic

1 - Reading

1 - OAB

MA 11 11 PM '58

EXECUTIVE REGISTER

Approved For Release 2002/02/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003800120026-2

Approved For Release 2002/02/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003800120026-2

Approved For Release 2002/02/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003800120026-2

the Redman to know of the great goodness and happiness that was ours. And, so, they carried the word to the original settlers of our country.

We started with a magnificent religious period. During the Revolution, we were led by a profoundly religious man, George Washington, who in his closing address to the people of the United States clearly indicated that the political well-being, in the broad sense, of this nation depended upon its understanding of its religious responsibility.

Religion always seems a little clearer in times of stress. Its meaning and its need shines through a little brighter under circumstances when it and its people are challenged. I always love to think of that lonely, modest, wonderful man, Abraham Lincoln, who suffered through the most divisive war in our history—and maybe in any history. And I like to think of what he had to say about the Bible,—something to the effect that one should take it as far as he could on reason, and from there on faith, and that as a result, he would live and die a better man. Not a profound statement but typical in its Lincolnian simplicity. It pointed out the possibilities, the meaningfulness of the Bible to our own people.

All through the war years, as one reads the letters of the presidents, one recognizes that these men of many different faiths all felt the necessity of going to God on their knees in times of great trial.

I remember during the period of the Korean War that our chapels were better attended than at any comparable period in the history of the United States.

On those occasions during that war when I was given the difficult and challenging assignment of awarding the Medal of Honor—in most instances posthumously—I thought what a strange alchemy it was that took a Tennessee farm boy, a New York boy from the streets, a rancher from Montana and brought out in him such acts of heroic valor. It was then that I knew that we, as a nation, inherently had greatness that could come only from dependence on God.

And so, as we have grown in size, and our civilization has advanced, our religion has advanced in a profoundly religious country. From two thousand churches at the time of the Revolution to three hundred thousand churches today is no measure at all of where we've come.

But again, in our religion, because we face a time of great trial, we must ask ourselves certain questions.

We've come far. When you run over the roster of how we've grown as a civilization and in religion, you can't help but be impressed. But we're faced today with a godless civilization in the Communist area that is dedicated basically to the elimination of our way of life. It is a young civilization, it is an

aggressive civilization and unfortunately it is in some ways a very competent civilization. It has managed to limit its weaknesses to a high degree, and it has sought consistently to strike at the weaknesses of the free world. Thus, if we must question ourselves in terms of where our civilization has taken us, so must we ask ourselves about our religion.

Are we as a nation inclined too much to take the form for the substance, is man going to church or is just making a donation the kind of religion that's going to carry us down the long road? Are we fundamentally prepared to recognize that, in the world that we live in, we have to contribute to those who do not have in order to maintain a balance of economic power around the world?

The great historian, Toynbee, once said that a historian three hundred years from now, looking back on our civilization, might identify this century—now only a little over half over—not as the age of tremendous advance in speed of transport, not as the era of reducing disease and death among mankind with discoveries like Salk vaccine, not even for the three bloodiest wars in the history of man, not even for splitting of the atom with its unparalleled capacities for destruction and for a constructive way of life, but as the age when man for the first time dared think that the benefits of civilization might be distributed to all mankind.

This can be done only by the United States of America, a nation whose generosity of spirit has exceeded that of any other nation in history. But it can be done only by a highly moral and a highly religious nation. The Russians have the people to send out under orders to Siberia, or else, death. We have to match that with an understanding that we have been a uniquely privileged race, that God has smiled upon us, that we owe back to this world a great deal that has been given us.

I do not mean in any sense of the word that this is something that should be done in a foolish, careless or non-sensible fashion. It requires careful and intelligent handling, but it requires breadth and generosity of spirit. This can come only from a religious nation—a nation that lives its religion, not merely during the weekly hour that it spends in church, not merely when it is raising funds for the church, but which lives it at all times and under all circumstances as a disciple of Christ.

Just as we are faced with the greatest challenge in the history of mankind, so too, we are faced with the greatest opportunity in the history of mankind. Whether we find an active, aggressive and courageous solution to the problem of fully implementing religion in American life may be the difference between a long-lived success for our civilization and its early demise.

# The Soviet Regime And The Russian People

## THE INTELLECTUAL REVOLT

By EUGENE LYONS, *Senior Editor of The Reader's Digest; First President and Presently a Trustee of the American Committee for Liberation*

*Delivered before the Advertising Club of Springfield, Massachusetts, May 20, 1958*

**L**IKE ALL PEOPLE who live by the printed word, I am perhaps inclined to exaggerate the role of books in human affairs. Yet the dramatic events of the last few years have tended to support our estimate.

It is a remarkable fact, and one worth pondering, that both in Red Poland and in Red Hungary the great popular

rebellions in the autumn of 1956 were not only sparked but in large measure led by writers and journalists. And in the Soviet Union proper, the ferments of discontent, the ominous rumblings of mutiny, have found expression in a low-key but genuine revolt of writers against their totalitarian chains. I think this phenomenon makes an appropriate starting point

Approved For Release 2002/02/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003800120026-2

for my major theme tonight, which is the great gulf separating the despotic Soviet regime from its subjects and victims, the peoples of Russia.

Traditionally, in Russia, it has been the so-called intelligentsia that has given voice to what the suffering and inarticulate masses felt. In Tsarist times, the most daring critics of social evils, the most effective crusaders for change, were novelists and playwrights and poets. The centers of idealistic protest, the seed-beds of revolution, were the colleges and the universities.

That pattern has held true in the Soviet period. If this has not often been apparent to the naked eye, it is only because oppression and censorship have been a hundred times more brutal under the Soviets than in the worst Tsarist years. The opportunities for overt protest have been meager, the penalties swift and terrible.

Despite this, the ratio of political arrests has always been higher on the Soviet campus than in the population as a whole. Writers and artists, historians and scientists, professors and students have provided a larger share of the inmates of Soviet prisons and concentration camps, percentage-wise, than any other groups.

With few exceptions, the Russian intelligentsia today is Soviet born and Soviet bred. Yet we have had striking proof in recent years that it is, from the Kremlin's viewpoint, deeply subversive.

After the death of Stalin, his successors cautiously relaxed some of the police terror and thought controls—not because they are any more humane than their dead master but because they had reason to dread the wrath of their subjects. The first and most startling effect of this minor moderation was a burst of books and plays, articles and poems critical of Soviet conditions that sent a chill down the spine of the Kremlin bosses.

The short-lived period of reduced pressure has come to be called "The Thaw," from the title of a novel dealing, for the first time in many years, with the personal interests and the private emotions of real people, rather than the stock emotions of stock characters of official propaganda.

But it was another novel, "Not By Bread Alone," by a young writer named Dudintsev, which became the symbol and storm center of the muted revolt. Considered as literature, it was hardly of first rank. But it told a story that dramatized the struggle between an individual and the state bureaucracy. Millions of Soviet people, most of whom hadn't even read the novel, therefore saw in it an assertion of their dignity as human beings as against the faceless and soulless state.

In the universities especially the Dudintsev book became a kind of banner of protest. Literary discussions overran their bounds into the dangerous area of political debate. At one session, in Moscow University, the author was present. Scared by the Pandora's box his book had opened, Dudintsev tried to minimize its political implications. But the students turned on him, accused him of showing less courage than the hero of his story.

At one point the Writers Union in Moscow called a conference to appraise the novel. What followed was more like a riot. The police had to be called to control the crowds trying to get in. The same kind of thing happened all over the country. And the book was merely typical of a rash of outspoken and sometimes angry writings.

This was only part of the intellectual revolt to which I referred. Its significance was that it reflected, as in a mirror, the feelings of a large part of the population—how large we can only guess.

It was with good reason, therefore, that the men in the Kremlin were thoroughly alarmed. They saw the immensity

of the resentments and despairs under the seemingly calm surface of their monolithic dictatorship. To add to their fright, they saw how, across the frontiers in Poland and Hungary, what started with the same sort of literary mutiny was exploding into nationwide popular murinies.

So they cracked down hard on the new literary freedom. The thaw was over. A new freeze set in. Outwardly today intellectual life in Soviet Russia is again almost as wintry and barren as in the toughest Stalin years. No more truth-telling books can be published. Most of the angry authors have been forced publicly to recant their "sins."

Thousands of students have been purged from Soviet universities, many of them being hustled off to the slave camps. Last year, in the University of Leningrad alone, according to one report, 4000—about half the entire student body—were expelled for political reasons.

But we now know as a certainty that under the new layer of ice, Soviet writers and artists and students are thinking their own thoughts. We have no reason to doubt that at the first opportunity they will again break through the crust. And in the end, I for one am convinced, the autocrats will find it impossible to suppress them.

Of all the big communist lies, the biggest and most cynical is their claim that the Soviet regime is loved and cherished by those who live under it. The claim has been so continually repeated, and echoed by gullible non-communists, that millions in the free world accept it as a fact.

The myth, for that is what it is, has been reinforced by simple-minded tourists to the communist Mecca. They take a quick look, note that there are no barricades or riots, and return home with the glad tidings that the people enthusiastically support the regime.

Since another travel season is in the offing, I might say in passing that I have very little respect for tourist testimony, and that includes U. S. Senators and one-shot journalistic visitors to Russia. If I sound a bit emphatic on the subject, it's because I watched them close-up during the six years when I lived in Moscow and have followed their accounts ever since.

In other places these travelers seem content to take in the sights and sample the night life. No sooner, however, do they cross the Soviet frontier than they turn into combination sociologists, economists and historians. Almost invariably they report that conditions have "improved" a lot—though they haven't the faintest notion what conditions used to be. If one tenth part of the improvement vouched for by tourists through the years were true, Soviet Russia by this time would have been a full-fledged paradise.

Then these two-week or six-week experts report, as I said, that the people support the regime. As one prominent journalist put it in a *Saturday Evening Post* article not too long ago, they have "learned to love their chains."

Fortunately that's a libel, a cruel libel, on the Russians.

Why, if the people loved their chains, would the Kremlin have needed, through all these decades, a secret-police establishment and concentration camps on a scale without precedent in all human history?

The Russian Tsars, though openly menaced by organized revolutionary movements, got by with a political police force—the Okhrana—of four or five thousand officials and operatives. Their political prisoners and Siberian exiles, in the most repressive periods, never numbered more than 20 or 30 thousand.

The Soviet Tsars, by contrast, have a political police machine—the Cheka, the G. P. U., the N. K. V. D. and now the M. V. D., but just as ruthless under the changing names—of close to two million men, including a special army for purely internal operations. Their political prisoners numbered

Approved For Release 2002/02/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003800120026-2

15 million at the peak and must still be counted by the million. Their political executions have run into the hundreds of thousands.

Never before, not even in a world that still included Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy, has a state spawned such gigantic organs of surveillance and terror, censorship and intimidation.

Why, if the people were already sold on the Soviet way of life, would the Kremlin need hundreds of thousands of agitator-propagandists giving their full time to "selling" the regime to its subjects? Soviet Russia is the only nation on record which maintains a vast network of special schools training these agitators; and propaganda is a daily and standard part of every school curriculum, every office and factory routine, every newspaper and radio program.

Let us have one common-sense fact clear in mind. Even the most sadistic police state doesn't murder its citizens wholesale or confine millions of them in pestiferous slave camps just for the fun of it. It does not without some good reason impose the death penalty for so-called crimes which in normal countries are unknown or treated as misdemeanors.

No government assigns a major part of its energies and manpower and resources to internal security unless it feels itself terribly insecure. These are measures of self-protection by the regime against actual or potential resistance.

Even under the abominated Nazis, it was comparatively easy for Germans to leave the country. But in Russia legal emigration is prohibited, and trying to leave the country illegally is punishable by death. Strange, is it not, that a dictatorship which boasts every hour on the hour of the enthusiastic loyalty of its "happy" people should take such extreme measures to keep them from escaping their Garden of Eden.

No less strange, under the circumstances, are the extremes to which the Kremlin crowd goes to shield the minds of its devoted subjects from the contamination of competing ideas. It maintains an absolute embargo against infidel newspapers, magazines and books from the non-Soviet world, except for purely technical and scientific publications. It has spent literally billions of rubles to jam foreign radio programs.

It happens that I had a hand myself in founding the American Committee for Liberation—a private group that finances Radio Liberation, a radio station in Germany over which former Soviet citizens broadcast to their countrymen. Moscow has paid us the unpleasant compliment of murdering two of the emigres on our staff and has been trying to intimidate others. We have calculated that the Soviets invest at least ten times more to jam our programs than we invest in broadcasting them.

Surely this gigantic and costly effort to isolate the Soviet people from outside influences would be unnecessary if the Kremlin rulers were really confident of the loyalty of those whom they rule.

The communists have fairly well succeeded in convincing the world that the peoples of Russia bent their necks meekly to the yoke of communism. But this is sheer bluff. Contrary to the general belief, both the Italian and German people submitted to their respective totalitarian afflictions more quickly, more fully, with less violent resistance, than the Russians.

The first four years of Soviet power saw a bloody civil war. Because the people were divided among themselves and without effective leaders, they were defeated. But they never really surrendered. They continued the struggle by other means—by means that were called non-cooperation when they were used in India. Never doubt that there has been plenty of fire under the smoke of the Kremlin's hysterical outcries

against counter-revolutionaries, saboteurs and other enemies within.

The one constant in the muffled turbulence of Soviet history, from 1917 to date, has been the struggle between the regime and the people. There have been periods of reduced hostilities, like the one under Stalin in the middle 1930's and the one under Khrushchev now. But there has never been a true armistice, let alone a reconciliation.

It is useful to recall that in the middle 1930's, too, the terror was relaxed, a new fine-sounding Constitution was promulgated and a smiling Stalin was having himself photographed kissing babies and prize-winning milkmaids. Abroad the prevailing view, then, was that the worst was over—the dictatorship was mellowing or evolving in the direction of moderation. Soon enough that wishful thinking fantasy collapsed in the bloodiest purges in history. I'm not suggesting that history will necessarily repeat itself, but I wouldn't bet to the contrary.

What the world has witnessed in Russia without understanding it is a *permanent civil war*. In the early years it was active and military; since then it has been passive but no less bloody. Once you grasp this concept of a continuing internal conflict, much about Soviet Russia that seems baffling begins to make sense.

The many millions who have perished at the regime's hands, whether finished off in police dungeons or starved in punitive man-made famine, are the casualties of that war. The hordes of inmates of slave camps are its prisoners-of-war. The perennial purges and liquidations are battles in that war. The incessant thunder of propaganda is the psychological offensive that has become an essential element in modern warfare.

Yes, permanent civil war—that is the reality under all the pretenses, the key to an understanding of the dictatorship. Russia has been and remains a nation occupied from within. Its communist masters are in essence an occupation force.

The fairy tale of unity between regime and people does not jibe with the terrible compulsion the regime has been obliged to apply; with the vast slave-labor population; with the chronic Kremlin alarms over sabotage and espionage and the ubiquitous enemy within.

The great historic test of the claim of popular acceptance of the regime, of course, came in 1941, when the Germans suddenly invaded Soviet Russia. Consider the facts:

For nearly a quarter of a century the Soviet dictators had been forcibly remolding the older generation, killing off those who would not lend themselves to the process, and rearing a new generation in its own ugly image. Toward this end it had applied its monopoly of force—the physical force that breaks bodies and the propaganda force that maims mind and spirit. Presumably a new "Soviet man" had taken the place of the historic Russian. This presumption was widely credited abroad; some solemn books were written describing this triumph of what Moscow called "human engineering."

Then, on the morning of June 22, 1941, came the first concrete test of this handiwork, and it turned out to be a silly figment of propaganda.

One would suppose that as the Nazi hordes poured into the land, the Kremlin, as a matter of course, would summon its engineered Soviet men to a holy crusade in defense of the new Soviet society, of the communized farms and the socialized industry. One expected Stalin and his minions to invoke the hallowed names of Marx and Lenin.

But they did nothing of the sort. The celebrated "Soviet man" might never have been. Instead, the dictators appealed to the Russian past and its maligned leaders. They invoked the names of Peter the Great and Ivan the Terrible and

Approved For Release 2002/02/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003800120026-2

General Suvorov. They exhorted the people to revive the spirit that defeated Napoleon's Grand Army more than a century before.

Communist slogans were dropped and the word "socialism" was hardly mentioned. Even the outlawed Church was restored and church-bells were rung on the Soviet radio. Why? Because Stalin knew, because every Soviet person knew, what their foreign admirers didn't—that the masses might be moved to defend their native soil but would not lift a finger to defend the regime that had exploited and terrorized them. To this day that conflict figures in the Soviet history textbooks not as a communist war but as the Fatherland War or the Great Patriotic War.

Stalin himself repeatedly told American visitors in the war years that the people were not fighting for him or for communism but for their native land. And he was right. In the first stages of the war, the desperate Russian people, cut off from the rest of Europe and knowing little of what had happened in Germany, looked upon their invaders as liberators from the communist yoke.

In the initial six months the Germans gathered in more than three million prisoners, which would have been impossible had the Red forces really put up a fight. Entire Soviet regiments and whole armies gave up without offering real resistance. And everywhere—Belorussia, in the Ukraine, in all-Russian areas like Smolensk, Vyazma and Bryansk—the civilian population met the Germans joyously and thousands offered their services to the conquerors.

Had the invaders been free men, in truth bringing liberation instead of a new form of slavery, it would have been curtains for the Soviet regime. But Hitler at that point saved Stalin. His black and brown legions unleashed their own brands of terror, made worse by the arrogance of their master-race pretensions. Quickly enough the people realized that they had only a grim choice between their native tyranny and an imported tyranny, and gradually they made the inevitable choice, rallying around the hated Kremlin against the Germans.

Even at that, close to a million Soviet soldiers donned German uniforms—the only massive quisling army the Nazis were able to raise among conquered peoples—in the naive hope of using the Germans to defeat the Soviets. And vast numbers took to the woods and hills and swamps to fight against both the Red and the German armies—remnants of those forces were holding out in the Carpathian mountains and other areas ten years after the end of the war.

In the current issue of a magazine called *Orbis*, published by the University of Pennsylvania, Prof. Robert Strausz-Hupe sums up that acid test in these words:

"The masses of Russia itself, although cowed by their rulers, detest them. It was only by a hair's breadth and thanks to the incredible blunders by the Nazis that communist rule was saved from the wrath of its own people who, when the invaders advanced, were ready to accept them as liberators."

The rest of the world has forgotten that amazing piece of fairly recent history. But the men in the Kremlin, we may be sure, never forget it. They must reckon that in any future conflict there is at least the possibility that they would again have to fight against their own people.

Since the end of the war the Soviets have had 13 years more for their job of human engineering. But they still cannot count, like normal governments, on the automatic allegiance of their subjects. They have not yet achieved what the political scientists call "legitimacy"—the natural, unquestioning loyalty of the citizens to their rulers.

Their government does not rest on free consent of the governed, as under a traditional monarchy or a democracy. It continues to rest on the world's largest police establishment,

on unlimited agitation and indoctrination, on hysterical propaganda about enemies within and threats from without.

For all its unlimited power—because of this absence of limits—the regime is perpetually on the defensive in relation to its citizenry, boasting, promising and above all, threatening. The identity between rulers and the ruled that other regimes take for granted, this one is continually proclaiming. In truth it is thus proclaiming its feeling of uncertainty about its own status and tenure.

Provided we recognize it and make use of it, this tension between the Kremlin and its people may prove more decisive than the Sputniks and ballistic missiles.

It would be suicidal folly to underestimate the threat of Soviet scientific achievements and growing military might. They leave us no alternative, in terms of sheer survival, but to maintain industrial and military leadership, regardless of sacrifices involved. We have no margins for complacency.

This does not mean, however, that we should paralyze ourselves with panic fear of the Soviets. Never forget that Soviet Russia made its greatest territorial conquests, enslaving nation after nation, in the very years when the United States had a monopoly of atomic power. Stalin did not allow himself to be overawed by our indubitable military superiority. Why need the free world allow itself today to be overawed by what is at worst equality?

It seems to me, ladies and gentlemen, that the defeatist attitudes spreading in the free world are a far greater menace than intercontinental missiles. If we sink into a mood of appeasement and surrender, the communists will take over the world without war, by intimidating one country after another into submission.

After all, the Kremlin leaders have as much reason to dread war as we have. Only if we convince them—as some spokesmen in the free world seem eager to convince them—that we have suffered a loss of nerve, that we no longer have the will to fight and die if necessary, will they be tempted to start a war. Now, as always in the past, every appeasement of a dynamic expansionist power brings the world closer to the ultimate catastrophe.

Ever since the Pharaohs built the Pyramids, tyrants, contemptuous of the needs and sufferings of their people, have been able to make dramatic achievements in limited areas. The Sputniks have been paid for out of the bellies and off the backs of a helpless population. They have been made possible by the ruthless sweating and exploitation of 200 million people. The same regime which orbits artificial moons is still unable to provide its masses with decent homes, clothes and food. Incredibly primitive living conditions and political tyranny are the price the people pay for the spectacular gains in the might of the state.

Without doubt the ordinary Russian takes pride in the technological progress, but he does not fail to see the irony of the contrast between Sputniks in his skies and wretchedness on his earth.

Even in the nuclear age, a nation's fundamental industry is agriculture. But Soviet agriculture is so backward that 52 million farmers—half of the country's total work force—can't raise enough food for an adequate diet. In the United States, by contrast, some eight million farmers, only an eighth of the work force, produce such abundance that their serious problem is surplus food.

As measured in over-all industrial production, Soviet Russia stands today approximately where the United States stood in 1900. In its 21 basic industries, The Russian lag behind our country in per capita output is greater today than it was before the 1917 revolution.

With half its laboring force on the farms, the manpower

Approved For Release 2002/02/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003800120026-2

left for industrial purposes is actually smaller than ours, despite its larger population. And this bottleneck is made worse by the fact it takes two or three workers in the Soviet Union to produce what one worker does in the United States. At the same time Moscow's hope of exploiting its empire in Eastern Europe has been dissipated. Communism has so depleted the economic vitality of the satellite countries that they are now a drain on Russia.

I have no intention, I repeat, of underestimating the Soviet industrial-military potential. But the Russians are not ten feet tall. If they have temporarily outstripped us in a few selected items, it is only because we have been remiss in making the most of our clear superiority. Ours has been primarily a failure in vigilance that can and will be remedied.

Meanwhile, we should not yield an inch in our detestation of Soviet despotism, our compassion for its first and worst victims—the peoples of Russia—and our resolve that human decency shall prevail upon this earth. No matter how many Sputniks it hurls into the stratosphere, Soviet Russia remains a cruel police state, rooted in terror, feared and detested by its own people.

In a book I wrote several years ago, which some of you may have read at least in its *Reader's Digest* condensation, I called those people "our secret allies." Nothing has happened since then to cancel out that description. Much has happened to reinforce it. The hundred million people in Eastern Europe are openly the enemies of their puppet regimes and tens of millions in Russia proper are secretly the enemies of the Kremlin regime. This is the most hopeful element in the world equation.

Precisely because a balance of destructive force is being reached, the struggle by means short of war, the political and psychological contest we think of as the cold war, has become decisive. In that struggle the Kremlin's greatest weakness—and therefore our greatest advantage—is its failure to attain real unity with its subjects. Our opportunity and our duty, to ourselves and to all mankind, is to make common cause with those people against our common enemy.

I am talking about an all-out political and psychological offensive against the communist world—on the same scale,

with the same flexible methods but inflexible determination, as the communist offensive against our world. Unhappily we have not even begun to fight the cold war. If we lose it by default, we will be just as dead as if we lost a hot war.

I trust that no one will rush to the conclusion that I am predicting a revolution in Russia. I am merely pointing out that the ingredients of revolution are there. In the measure that we ignore the fact and fail to use it in order to keep the enemy off balance, we are making the Kremlin an invaluable gift.

In August 1955, soon after his return from the Geneva summit meeting, President Eisenhower spoke some words born out of the frustration of that conference.

"Eagerness to avoid war—if we think no deeper than this single desire—" he said, "can produce outright or implicit agreement that injustice and wrongs of the present shall be perpetuated into the future. We must not participate in any such false agreement. Thereby we would outrage our own conscience. In the eyes of those who suffer injustice we would become partners with their oppressors. In the judgment of history we would have sold out the freedom of men for the pottage of a false hope."

Those words are, if anything, more pertinent today than they were three years ago. We must keep faith with our own civilization. We must differentiate sharply between the Moscow dictatorship and those whom it enslaves and despoils.

The over-all contest between the two worlds will not be decided by weapons alone. Indeed, the chances are that weapons will not be used. The contest will also be decided by ideas and by ideals, by the hunger of individual men—in Russia no less than in Hungary or our own country—for dignity, freedom and happiness.

If our supremacy in technology has for the moment been opened to question, our supremacy in the realm of the human spirit is beyond doubt. We have a clear advantage in human values, in spiritual insight, in political liberty and creative freedom. It is an advantage that weighs heavily in the scales of destiny. Let's not underrate or dissipate its force. Let us, rather, find the moral courage to use it boldly to rally to our side the humanity behind the Iron Curtain, and above all, the peoples of Soviet Russia.

## Some Solid American Investments

FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY, BROTHERHOOD, RELIGION

By CHARLES E. SHULMAN, Rabbi, Riverdale Temple, New York

Delivered before the Illinois Bankers Association, Palmer House, Chicago, May 15, 1958

**I**N THE *Cleveland Plain Dealer* there recently appeared an article written by the Financial Editor and headlined "Invest in America". It went on to say:

"A solid answer to the usual May Day show of muscle by the communists is being forged in Cleveland by business leaders from many industries. It will culminate in a civic luncheon. This is the "Invest in America" week celebration which is part of the national celebration to be held in more than seventy cities in the country. The theme this year is "Money at work means men at work." Another theme suggested was "Keep America out of the red and the Reds out of America." The purpose of "Invest in America" it was pointed out, is to emphasize that what has made America a great country with the highest living standard of any nation in history is the willingness

of men to invest their savings in present and new businesses with all the people being the real winners . . . It is the best defense against the isms that today threaten our national life. For our children's future job opportunities this "Invest in America" program must be continued . . ."

Reading the article, I could not help wondering—Is this all we should invest in America? Only the dollars we have saved? Is our job the best defense against the isms from abroad that threaten our national life? Is our material standard of living our only asset to protect us and keep us strong amid world tensions and cold war? Is this what drew the Pilgrim Fathers to these shores and caused us to rebel against England? Is this what inspired the Gettysburg Address? Is this what the teeming immigrants from all corners of the world were think-

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Dulles

This speech was brought to your attention by Stan Grogan and, as you recall, you wanted a letter written to Mr. Lyons. Stan Grogan has concurred in the attached reply.

*121825*  
AAB  
7 Aug 58  
*fr*  
(DATE)

FORM NO. 101 REPLACES FORM 10-101  
1 AUG 54 WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)